


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



L1

FILE:



Office: HOUSTON

Date:

OCT 02 2009

MSC 05 197 12542

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 245A of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, all documents have been returned to the National Benefits Center. You no longer have a case pending before this office, and you are not entitled to file a motion to reopen or reconsider your case. If your appeal was sustained or remanded for further action, you will be contacted.

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreements reached in *Catholic Social Services, Inc., et al., v. Ridge, et al.*, CIV. NO. S-86-1343-LKK (E.D. Cal) January 23, 2004, and *Felicity Mary Newman, et al., v. United States Immigration and Citizenship Services, et al.*, CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK (C.D. Cal) February 17, 2004 (CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements), was denied by the Director, Houston. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not provided credible evidence to establish that he had entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and thereafter continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal the applicant states that the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) denied his right to appeal the question of class membership to the Special Master. The applicant also challenged USCIS findings discrediting the testimony of some of the affiants. Although the director determined that the applicant had not established that he was eligible for class membership pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the director treated the applicant as a class member in adjudicating the Form I-687 application on the basis of whether the applicant had established continuous residence in the United States for the requisite period. Consequently, the applicant has neither been prejudiced by nor suffered harm as a result of the director's finding that the applicant had not established that he was eligible for class membership. The adjudication of the applicant's appeal as it relates to his claim of continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 shall continue.

An applicant for temporary resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). The applicant must also establish that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States since November 6, 1986. Section 245(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(3). The regulations clarify that the applicant must have been physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the term "until the date of filing" in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1) means until the date the applicant attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to timely file during the original legalization application period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. CSS Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 6; Newman Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 10. The applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite period, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. The inference

to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own testimony, and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

Although the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit in support of his or her claim of continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982, the submission of any other relevant document is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The “preponderance of the evidence” standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant’s claim is “probably true,” where the determination of “truth” is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). In evaluating the evidence, *Matter of E-M-* also stated that “[t]ruth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality.” *Id.* at 80. Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the petitioner submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is “probably true” or “more likely than not,” the applicant or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. *See U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 431 (1987) (defining “more likely than not” as a greater than 50 percent probability of something occurring). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application or petition.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1, 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by friends and family members and other evidence. The AAO will consider all of the evidence relevant to the requisite period to determine the applicant’s eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The USCIS adjudication officer’s notes during the applicant’s Form I-687 application interview reveal that the applicant claimed to have entered the United States without inspection in January, 1980. The applicant’s Form I-687 application indicates that the applicant last entered into the United States on May 1981 without a visa by crossing the border at Brownsville, Texas.

The applicant submitted several affidavits from friends to establish his initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period. The affidavits of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] all contain statements that the affiants have personally known and been acquainted with the applicant in the United States. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] declare that they have known the applicant since May and December, 1981. [REDACTED] states that he has known the applicant since 1983. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] state that they have known the applicant since 1988. [REDACTED] attests to being his landlord and that the applicant was living with her from 1988 through 1993 but does not give the address. The affiants generally attest to his good moral character but provided no other information about the applicant. [REDACTED] testimony is not relevant to the requisite period as she did not meet the applicant until 1990.

The applicant submitted with his response to the NOID affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The affiants state that they have personal knowledge that the applicant resided in the United States from May, 1985 and June, 1981, respectively. The affiants attest to being friends and socializing with the applicant once a month but provide no other information about the applicant.

Although the applicant has submitted numerous affidavits in support of his application, the affidavits submitted do not contain sufficiently detailed descriptions to establish the reliability of their assertions. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. The absence of sufficiently detailed affidavits to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of his claim. For instance, none of the witnesses supplies any details about the applicant's life, such as, knowledge about his education, hobbies, children, shared activities and the date and manner he entered the United States.

The affiants do not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of those associations and demonstrate that they were a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence during the time addressed in the declarations. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that the relationship probably did exist and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the requisite period.

The remaining evidence is a letter from [REDACTED]. The letter states that the applicant residing at [REDACTED] is a registered member of the parish as of March 21, 2005.

This letter does not address the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period and will not be considered.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E- M--*, *supra*. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.